



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,357	10/14/2003	Yoshimasa Funakawa	02197CD/HG	6706
1933	7590	01/23/2007	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC			SMITH, NICHOLAS A	
220 Fifth Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
16TH Floor			1742	
NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,357	FUNAKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Nicholas A. Smith	Art Unit 1742	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2006.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

· Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

· Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/4/2006 has been entered.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-3 remain for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

4. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese patent 6-264185 (JP'185) cited by applicant in IDS dated October 14, 2003.

6. JP'185 in paragraph 22 on page 4 discloses a process of manufacturing a high strength hot rolled analogous steel alloy plate (equivalent to sheet) comprising the steps of hot rolling at 1150C (within the claimed hot rolling temperature range of Ar3 point or

higher) followed by coiling at 500 to 700C (encompassing claimed coiling temperature range of 550 to 700C), which would meet the claimed process steps.

7. Moreover, as shown in the English abstract, JP'185 process uses a steel alloy with constituents whose wt% ranges overlap those recited by the claims and such overlap in alloy wt% ranges establishes a *prima facie* case of obviousness because it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the claimed alloy wt% ranges over the broader disclosure of the prior art since prior art teaches similar utility (components for a machine structure) and high strength properties, see MPEP 2144.05. In regards to the claimed formula, it is well settled that there is no invention in the discovery of a general formula if it covers a composition described in the prior art, *In re Copper and Foley* 1943 C.D. 357, 553 O.G. 177; 57 USPQ 117, *Taklatwalla v. Marburg*, 620 O.G. 685, 1949 C.D. 77, and *In re Pilling*, 403 O.G. 513, 44 F(2) 878, 1931 C.D. 75. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the selection of the proportions of elements would appear to require no more than routine investigation by those ordinary skilled in the art. *In re Austin, et al.*, 149 USPQ 685, 688. In the instant case, the claimed equation limitation cover a composition selected from the range of compositions described in JP'185 (abstract).

8. In regards to claim limitation "a high strength hot rolled steel sheet having tensile strength of not less than 780 MPa," Applicant is reminded that JP'185 does teach the same method as the instant claimed invention by using same process and overlapping composition and therefore one would expect such a prior art method to produce a steel sheet with the claimed tensile strength. Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or

unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). See MPEP 2112.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. Applicant argues:

a. Steel E (0.047%C-0.01%Si-1.62%Mn-0.91%Cr-0.05%Mo-0.143%Ti) in Table 2 of JP'185 and Steel A (0.045%C-0.05%Si-1.67%Mn-0.056%Cr-0.20%Mo-0.085%Ti) in Table 1 of the instant specification have tensile strengths of 716MPa and 820MPa, respectively, yielding unexpectedly good properties with a reduction in the amount added of additional components.

11. Examiner responds:

a. A comparison of Steel E of table 2 in JP'185 and of Steel A of table 1 in instant specification is not sufficient to establish criticality of the instant claimed composition range in that, as applicant states, compositions of Cr, Mo and Ti are different. For instance, the applicant has not demonstrated that 0.10 wt% Ti as claimed (0.02 to 0.10 wt% Ti) has better properties in comparison with 0.11 wt% as disclosed in the prior art (of 0.02-0.20 wt% Ti). It is noted that in the prior art that 0.085 wt% Ti contains significantly different Cr content (0.056 wt%, Steel A, Table 1 in specification) in comparison with Cr content (0.91 wt% Cr, Steel E, Table 2 in JP'185).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas A. Smith whose telephone number is (571)-272-8760. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday.
13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571)-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RK
ROY KING
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER
TEL: (571) 272-1700